

media; while at the same time we have seen important public interest protections eliminated. For the first 50 years after enactment of the 1934 Communications Act, people had a right to petition the FCC if they found coverage to be one-sided. The "fairness doctrine" required broadcasters to cover issues of public importance and to do so fairly until, in 1987, under immense pressure from the media, it was eliminated. The loss of the fairness doctrine—a major blow to consumers—was supposed to be alleviated by a blossoming of independent, local outlets that would expand diversity by increasing competition. In other words, consumers would no longer be able to use the fairness doctrine to ensure that their views were represented on a specific media outlet but would be able to present those views through competing media in the same market. Unfortunately, the public is now faced with increased concentration—not increased competition—and no longer has the fairness doctrine to fall back on.

In the last 25 years, the number of TV station owners has declined from 540 to 460 and the number of TV newsrooms has dropped by almost 15 percent. Three-quarters of cable channels are owned by only six corporate entities, four of which are major TV networks. Seventy percent of all markets have 4 or fewer sources of original TV news production. In 1975, there were 860 owners of daily newspapers. There are less than 300 today. My constituents and many constituents across the Nation are frustrated that they are unable to hear different viewpoints and, increasingly, that they are unable to get their own viewpoints to others because of barriers to the visual and print media. I believe that there is significant argument for the FCC to recommend reinstatement of the fairness doctrine. At the very least, they should not allow even more ownership concentration that makes the loss of the fairness doctrine even more onerous.

Greater media ownership concentration limits the public's access to diverse viewpoints. Radio provides an example of what can happen when media ownership rules are abolished. In 1996, Congress eliminated the national ownership caps for radio. The result has been greater consolidation in the radio industry. In 1995, Clear Channel owned 1.3 percent of radio stations; today it owns 20.2 percent. In almost half of the largest markets, the three largest corporations control 80 percent of the radio audience. This has made it harder for diverse opinions to be heard. Just last month, Clear Channel refused to air an advertisement in which Congressman DANNY DAVIS and I expressed our opposition to waging war in Iraq. Clear Channel refused to put the advertisement on the air. Fortunately, several independent stations did.

Clear Channel, which owns 1200 stations across the country, has refused to air songs by the Dixie Chicks who have spoken against war in Iraq, it has put out a recommended "do not play" list that includes John Lennon's "Imagine" and 150 other songs, it has actively worked to support pro war rallies, and it has refused to play paid ads that do not reflect its own views. This is what happens when a few companies control the airwaves. The owners' bias is reflected in what they choose to put on the air and listeners are limited in what they are able to hear.

Part of the problem is that many entities that own media outlets are more focused on their

bottom line than the public good and the public's right to hear and express diverse views. The founder and CEO and Clear Channel said in a recent Fortune Magazine article, "We're not in the business of providing news and information. We're not in the business of providing well researched music. We're simply in the business of selling our consumers products." I appreciate Mr. Lowry's candor and I do not dispute his right to pursue profits. However, his statement clearly illustrates the problem. Greater media ownership concentration will hurt our democracy.

We must maintain media diversity and localism. We cannot allow information to be monopolized, rationed or censored because a free and open media is absolutely critical to the functions of a democratic society. The stakes are high and the threat to free speech is all too real.

I urge all the FCC Commissioners to hold and attend more public forums across the country on any specific proposed changes to existing rules, as a major part of their decision-making process.

TRIBUTE TO RICHARD T. THOMPSON, CHANCELLOR OF OAKLAND COMMUNITY COLLEGE

HON. SANDER M. LEVIN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 10, 2003

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor a remarkable individual, Richard T. Thompson, Chancellor of Oakland Community College (OCC) upon his retirement from this outstanding five-campus institution.

Beginning his OCC career in 1996, Mr. Thompson was a member of the English, Social Science and Counseling faculty at the Highland Lakes Campus. He also served as Academic Dean and Campus Provost at that campus until 1975.

After 1975, Mr. Thompson held various positions, including Provost of the Orchard Ridge Campus, and College District Vice President for academic and student affairs in 1984. He was promoted to Vice Chancellor of academic affairs in 1988, and served as OCC's Interim Chancellor. In 1995 he was appointed Interim President of Auburn Hills Campus.

On March 19, 1996, Richard T. Thompson assumed the Chancellorship of OCC, as its sixth chief executive officer. This appointment marked the first time in history of the college that an OCC academician was chosen to head its five-campus institution.

Professional and community activities are also a significant part of Mr. Thompson's life. The Providence Hospital Community Board, the Educational Advisory Board, the Oakway Symphony and the Better Business Bureau are some examples of the wide range of interest and service he has provided.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in honoring Richard T. Thompson for his dedication and devotion to Oakland Community College, an outstanding institution of higher learning, and for the high quality of education and the inspiration he has provided for its students during his tenure.

I wish Richard, and his wife, Nancy, good health and happiness in whatever paths they choose to take in retirement.

EMERGENCY WARTIME SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2003

SPEECH OF

HON. BETTY MCCOLLUM

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 3, 2003

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union had under consideration the bill, (H.R. 1559) making emergency wartime supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2003, and for other purposes:

Ms. McCOLLUM. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of the fiscal year 2003 supplemental appropriations bill, yet express my sincere disappointment that the amendment offered by Representative OBEY to increase funding for our homeland security needs was defeated on a party-line vote.

I support our troops in the field, and believe it is the responsibility of Congress to provide our armed servicemen and women with the resources they need to achieve victory in Iraq and return home quickly and safely to their families. Just as important, however, is the responsibility of Congress to ensure the safety and security of our hometowns. Representative Obey's amendment would have added \$2.5 billion for homeland security needs, including \$150 million for State public health and environmental laboratories to deal with chemical weapons attacks, \$800 million for the equipment and training needed to let local fire, police, and medical personnel meet the difficult challenges a terrorist attack would entail, and \$66 million to help the Reserves train and relocate deployable military hospitals. This amendment would have taken a significant step to protect American communities and neighborhoods.

By rejecting this amendment, the House missed an opportunity to address pressing unmet needs for protection of the American people from terrorist attacks. I am concerned that the failure of the amendment to be made in order will delay for months and perhaps longer the implementation of numerous simple, straightforward steps that we should be taking to prevent future catastrophic attacks against the United States.

For the RECORD, I submit a copy of a letter I received from Minnesota Department of Public Safety Commissioner Rich Stanek, urging support of additional funds for homeland security in the supplemental to assist Minnesota's rising homeland security needs. Representative Obey's amendment would have gone a long way toward meeting this need, but unfortunately the Republican Party in Congress said "no" to Minnesota and "no" to this new funding.

Protecting our homeland is a nonpartisan issue. Nothing is more important than the security of our hometowns and our families. As this bill moves to conference with the Senate, I hope we can agree that homeland security needs must be above party-line politics.

MINNESOTA DEPARTMENT  
OF PUBLIC SAFETY

St. Paul, MN, March 28, 2003.

Hon. BETTY MCCOLLUM,  
Longworth House Office Building  
Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE MCCOLLUM: As the United States continues military action to